

REMARKS

This is in supplemental response to the Official Action currently outstanding with regard to the above-identified case, which Official Action the Examiner has designated as being FINAL, and the Advisory Action of 9 May 2011 in the above-identified application, wherein subsequent to the entry of the Amendment After Final Rejection of 15 April 2011 the subject application has been further amended as set forth above prior to its consideration on the merits in response to the concurrently filed Request for Continued Examination. In other words, the foregoing Amendment is to be entered after the entry of Applicants' Amendment After Final Rejection Under 37 CFR 1.116 and before reconsideration of this application on the concurrently filed Request for Continued Examination.

In view of the Examiner's comments in the Advisory Action of 9 May 2011, Applicants by the foregoing Supplemental Amendment have defined the "ID" as "being a target with which a process is associated by use of a program" so as to clarify the distinction between the present invention over the Yoon reference (US Published Patent Application No. 2004/0175154), which associates each file name with time.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 58 as hereinabove amended is not obvious over the combination of the Yoon reference and the Chung reference (US Published Patent Application No. 2003/0095794) because it includes a feature that is not disclosed in either the Yoon or the Chung reference, that is, the use of an ID 'being a target with which a process is associated by use of a program'. Further in this regard, since claim 58 as hereinabove amended defines the "ID" as "being a target with which a process is associated by use of the program", the presently claimed arrangement is respectfully submitted to clearly be the basis for the advantages that (i) being able to change a program without correcting synchronization timing information so as to change a process to be carried out, and (ii) the program does not need to be rewritten even in cases where the video data is edited after creating the program.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner seems to have totally disregarded the content of the first and second paragraphs of page 14 of the Remarks that accompanied their Amendment After Final Rejection under 37 CFR 1.116 of 15 April 2011 which state:

On the other hand, unlike the “synchronization file” of the Yoon reference relied upon by the Examiner, the “synchronization timing information” recited in pending Claim 58 of the above-identified application does not link a file name and time, but rather “indicates a correspondence of a time point and an ID”. Moreover, the “program” of pending Claim 58 of the above-identified application is not content like the “ENAV data” of the Yoon reference, but rather “registers a process in association with the ID”.

In this way, the “synchronization timing information” and the “program” obtained as separate files as recited in pending Claim 58 of the above-identified application are different and distinct from the “synchronization file” and the “ENAV data” managed as different files in the Yoon reference relied upon by the Examiner.

in his analysis of the content of the final paragraph of Page 13 thereof. Hence, the fact that the Yoon reference may describe a configuration in which “data to be synchronized and a synchronization file are managed as separate files” is not seen to render the scope of the claims of this application broader than the argument supporting the same.

In this respect, in the present invention the synchronization timing information relates a time point in the content data with an ID and the program that is managed separately from the content data. In addition, the synchronization timing information is invoked by the program executing section in response to the ID. Accordingly, the synchronization in the present invention is separated from the program *per se* as distinct from a trigger that will invoke whatever program is then registered in the data acquiring section. In other words, in distinction relative to Yoon wherein the data and the synchronization file are managed as separate files, there is no synchronization file *per se* in the present invention, but rather a separate synchronization timing information and a program.


Applicants respectfully submit that the above distinction is significant because the synchronization timing information is only concerned with the timing of the reproduction of the content so as to trigger whatever program may be independently registered. Therefore, to the extent that the synchronization is deemed to be associated with a timing determination, that determination is separated from the program that is to act on the content in the present invention contrary to the cited art wherein the synchronization and the data are intertwined with one another whether in the Chung model or the more diverse Yoon model.

Accordingly, in view of the foregoing Amendments and Remarks (and the Amendment After Final Rejection Under 37 CFR 1.116 of 15 April 2011), Applicants respectfully submit that all of the Examiner's currently outstanding objections and rejections now have been overcome. Hence, entry of the foregoing Amendments, reconsideration, and allowance of the above-presented claims in response to this submission are respectfully requested.

Finally, Applicants believe that additional fees beyond those submitted herewith are not required in connection with the consideration of this response to the currently outstanding Official Action. However, if for any reason a fee is required, a fee paid is inadequate or credit is owed for any excess fee paid, you are hereby authorized and requested to charge and/or credit Deposit Account No. **04-1105**, as necessary, for the correct payment of all fees which may be due in connection with the filing and consideration of this communication.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 13, 2011



SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Reg. No.: 27,840

David A. Tucker
(type or print name of practitioner)
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Tel. No. (617) 517-5508

Edwards Angell Palmer & Dodge LLP
P.O. Box 55874
P.O. Address

Customer No.: 21874

Boston, MA 02205